

#### Geographic scope (5.1)

Subgroup to convene Monday at 8:30 to consider deleting sentence that starts with “Accordingly...” and adding some qualifier to address Sac Valley concern.

#### Covered species (6.1.1)

Minor edits from subgroup including replacing “upland” with “floodplain”, moving the 3 fish species to the first sentence, and reviewing the “federally and state listed and candidate” language to make sure it includes all of the fish species and correcting it if it does not. Laura King Moon to provide edits. NGOs will review it to make sure they are OK.

#### Interim projects (7.4.1)

Subgroup on Monday at 1:00 to develop language that says that MOA project review under existing laws is sufficient to ensure that they are consistent with BDCP or something like this.

#### Definitions (1.0)

Edit to 1.1 approved. Need to add NGO’s to attachment A. DFG lawyers to look at differences in definitions from NCCPA.

#### CESA assurances (4.7)

Agreed to delete.

#### BDCP’s relationship to CALFED

Subgroup on Monday at 1:00 to focus on how to say BDCP is separate from CALFED, consistent with CALFED goals, and will be coordinated with CALFED (and maybe Delta vision).

#### Scope of off-ramp (9.8)

Subgroup on Monday at 1:00 to look at language to acknowledge that approval of projects under 2081 may influence DFG ability to approve under NCCPA. DFG will review the current language.

#### Covered activities (7.5) *(completed)*

#### Current law

Possible need for conversation among several steering committee members. No changes to agreement except as may be noted elsewhere.

#### Governance (7.4.1)

Anthony Saracino to come up with language on sharing information early and often. Clarify that the BDCP does not need to meet FACA requirements.

#### Role of Resources

Resources will be a party.

#### Planning goals (3)

This will be part of the discussion of the relationship to CALFED on Monday at 1:00 because of the NGO concern over relationship to recovery goal.

#### Amendments (9.6)

Agreed to delete "...each of the then-existing...". There was also a mention that some wanted to be able to add both parties and PREs on approval from PRE's but I didn't write down if this was a global approval.

7.6.1: There was a comment that the use of "Reportable" and Non-Reportable" sends mixed messages; consider revising these terms. There was also discussion about revising the second sentence beginning with "Specifically, the Parties...."